lowing recommendations, which were adopted:

1. That the vote of the Toronto conference in favor of the idea of federation be reaffirmed.

2. That the proposed federation be styled the Federation of American Biological Societies.

3. That the members of the federation be societies, not individuals, and that all societies represented in this conference (a list of which is given below) be eligible to charter membership.

4. That a council of the federation be established, consisting of two representatives from each society, these to be the president and secretary unless otherwise designated by the society.

5. That the council choose an executive committee from its own membership.

The committee that made the foregoing report was continued as an executive committee *pro tempore* of the conference, and to it was intrusted the task of drawing up a constitution and by-laws in accordance with the above general plan. The instructions of this committee call for completion of its work at a reasonably early date, and the transmission of its decisions and recommendations to the officers of the several societies by correspondence. It is expected that it will be possible to distribute the proposed constitution and by-laws to the members of the societies early next fall.

The executive committee *pro tem.* has the following personnel: Frank R. Lillie, University of Chicago; C. W. Greene, University of Missouri; I. F. Lewis, University of Virginia; C. E. McClung, University of Pennsylvania; A. Franklin Shull, University of Michigan; R. E. Thatcher, Agricultural Experiment Station, Geneva; H. B. Ward, University of Illinois; and B. E. Livingston, representing the American Association (Herbert Osborn to substitute for latter at August 4 meeting).

Considerable discussion was devoted to the problem of improving biological publications, a question likely to come before the council, if the plan of federation shall be adopted. This problem was considered so important that it was deemed advisable by the conference that some action be taken without waiting for the establishment of the federation. A special committee was, therefore, appointed to work in cooperation with a committee on the same subject from the Division of Biology and Agriculture of the National Research Council, to study the whole question of biological publications and report to the conference or to the federation if formed. The personnel of this committee is as follows:

A. P. Hitchens, Army Medical School.
I. F. Lewis, University of Virginia.
C. A. Kofoid, University of California.
D. R. Hooker, Johns Hopkins University.

The corresponding committee of the Division of Biology and Agriculture of the National Research Council is composed of the following members:

E. D. Ball, Department of Agriculture.
C. E. McClung, University of Pennsylvania.
J. R. Schramm, National Research Council.
A. F. Woods, University of Maryland.

The biological organizations represented at the Washington conference were as follows:

American Association for the Advancement of Science.

Sections F (Zoology), G (Botany), N (Medical Sciences), and O (Agriculture) of the American Association for the Advancement of Science.

Federation of American Societies for Experimental Biology.

The Executive Committee of the Division of Biology and Agriculture of the National Research Council.

American Society of Naturalists.

American Society of Zoologists.

Botanical Society of America.

Genetics Sections of the Botanical Society of America and the American Society of Zoologists.

American Genetic Association.

Ecological Society of America.

American Phytopathological Society.

American Society for Horticultural Science.

Society of American Foresters.

Society of American Bacteriologists.

American Society of Agronomy.

Entomological Society of America.

American Association of Economic Entomologists.

American Society of Animal Production.

American Dairy Science Association.

A. FRANKLIN SHULL,
Secretary of the Conference

HUIA ONSLOW

AT Cambridge, England, on June 27, Mr. Huia Onslow died. He was born in New Zealand on November 13, 1890, where his father, the Earl of Onslow, was then governor-general. To commemorate the place of his birth, he was

given the Maori name Huia, and was regarded as the honorary chief of a Maori tribe. Queen Victoria became his godmother. Favored by circumstance, strong and handsome, he passed through Eton and Cambridge University, with every prospect of a brilliant career. But when taking a holiday in the Tyrol in July, 1911, he struck his head against a rock in diving, and was so severely injured that he became paralyzed from the waist downward. An apparently helpless invalid, he was condemned to spend the rest of his life on a couch, able only to move his head and arms. Many men, so situated, would have given up all idea of useful activities, lamenting a life of supposedly unavoidable idleness. Not so Mr. Onslow. Having been much interested in biological subjects when in college, he returned to Cambridge, secured the necessary assistants, and ardently devoted himself to biological research. Those interested in genetics will remember his papers on heredity in moths, based on breeding experiments carried on in his laboratory. His doubtless most important work, of 74 pages, was "On a periodic structure in many insect scales, and the cause of their iridescent colours" (*Philosophical Transactions of the Royal Society,* July, 1921). In this elaborate and fully illustrated paper the iridescent colors of many insects of various orders are studied, using all the modern refinements of microscopic technique and the latest pertinent researches in physics. All the drawings on the three plates are by Mr. Onslow. A few years ago Mr. Onslow was married to Miss Muriel Wheldale, formerly a fellow of Newnham College, well-known for researches on biochemistry and especially for her book on the anthocyanin pigments of plants. Marriage did not prevent her from continuing her work at the university, and so Onslow lived, as he wished to do, in the atmosphere of the laboratories, closely in touch with whatever was going on, himself an actor in the great scientific drama of the day. When I saw him in 1920 I was struck by the keenness of his mind and the breadth of his interests. His was a remarkable life, fruitful in many ways, and ever worthy to be remembered.

T. D. A. COCKERELL
UNIVERSITY OF COLORADO

SCIENTIFIC EVENTS

ILLUMINATING ENGINEERING NOMENCLATURE AND PHOTOMETRIC STANDARDS

THE American Engineering Standards Committee announces that the Illuminating Engineering Nomenclature and Photometric Standards of the Illuminating Engineering Society, 1918 edition, have been approved by the American Engineering Standards Committee as "American Standard," with the substitution of six internationally agreed upon definitions for certain ones of the 1918 rules. The definitions which have been reworded are: luminous flux, luminous intensity, illumination, candle, lumen and lux.

The special committee of the American Engineering Standards Committee which examined the proposal submitted by the Illuminating Engineering Society and which recommended approval of the nomenclature and photometric standards included representatives of the U. S. Bureau of Standards, the American Gas Association, the American Physical Society, the International Acetylene Association, the Optical Society of America, the American Institute of Electrical Engineers, the Illuminating Engineering Society and the National Electric Light Association.

The new tests to be substituted for existing text in sections 3, 8, 9, 10, 12 and 13 of the Nomenclature and Standards Rules of the Illuminating Engineering Society of 1918 are as follows:

Section 3: Luminous Flux is the rate of flow of radiant energy evaluated with reference to visual sensation. Although luminous flux must strictly be defined as above, it may be regarded for practical photometric purposes as an entity, since the rate of flow is for such purposes invariable.

Section 8: The Luminous Intensity of a point source in any direction is the flux per unit solid angle emitted by the source in that direction. (The flux from any source of dimensions which are negligibly small by comparison with the distance at which it is observed may be treated as if it were emitted from a point.)

Section 9: Illumination at any point of a surface is the luminous flux density at that point, or, when the illumination is uniform, the flux per unit of intercepting area.